UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/659,481	09/10/2003	Douglas Dillon	PD-202114	3425

7590 08/10/2007	EXAMINER
Hughes Electronics Corporation	NANO, SARGON N

Hughes Electronics Corporation
Patent Docket Administration
Bldg. 1, Mail Stop A109
P.O. Box 956
El Segundo, CA 90245-0956

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2157	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/10/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/659,481	DILLON ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sargon N. Nano	2157	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *5/25/2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1 - 52* is/are pending in the application.

  4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1 - 52* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

  a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

  1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

  2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

  3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
  Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
  Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

Response to Amendment

1.   This action is responsive to Amendment filed on May 25, 2007. Claims 1 – 52 are

pending examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2.   Claims 1- 7, 9 – 20, 22 – 45, 47 – 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as

being anticipated by Chatterjee et al U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0043600

(referred to hereafter as Chatterjee).

As to claim 1, Chatterjee teaches a method for providing a proxy service to

retrieve content over a data network from a content server, the method comprising:

forwarding a request for the content over the data network towards the content

server, wherein a proxy in communication with the content server determines a plurality

of objects corresponding to the content based on the request, the proxy generating a list

specifying the objects that are to be pre-fetched according to a criterion (see

paragraphs 006, 0011, 0013 and 0014, Chatterjee discloses a remote client sends a

request for a page from a server through a proxy where the request includes a list of

object to be prefetched) ;

receiving the generated list in response to the request (see paragraph 0014, Chatterjee discloses receiving the list of objects);

receiving the pre-fetched objects on the list (see paragraph 0014 Chatterjee discloses receiving the prefetched requested data page) ; and selectively holding a subsequent request associated with an object specified on the list (see paragraph 006, Chatterjee discloses all subsequent requests are directed to proxy after the list of objects is prefetched).

As to claim 2, Chatterjee teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein the proxy in the forwarding step obtains domain name service (DNS) information associated with the request, the method further comprising: receiving from the proxy the DNS information piggybacked on one of the pre-fetched objects (see paragraph 0036).

As to claim 3, Chatterjee teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein the proxy in the forwarding step receives a cookie associated with one of the pre-fetched objects and determines whether the received cookie matches that of a cookie provided in the request, the proxy not forwarding the pre-fetched object if there is no match (see paragraphs, 0048 and 0078).

As to claim 4, Chatterjee teaches a method according to claim 3, wherein the proxy in the forwarding step compares a domain name specified in the request with the cookie associated with the one pre-fetched object (see paragraph 0036).

As to claim 5, Chatterjee teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein the proxy in the forwarding step assigns a plurality of identifiers corresponding to the objects in the list, the method further comprising: forwarding a message to the proxy

specifying one of the identifiers to avoid duplicate retrieval of the one corresponding

object (see paragraph 0039).

As to claim 6, Chatterjee teaches a method according to claim 5, further

comprising: rejecting a pre-fetched objected from the list based upon one of a rejection

of the list and a discrepancy of the identifiers(see paragraph 0039).

As to claim 7, Chatterjee teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein the

criterion in the forwarding step includes one of object size and object type (see

paragraph 0039).

As to claim 9, Chatterjee teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein the

content conforms with a markup language that includes Hypertext Markup Language

(HTML) (see paragraph 0017).

As to claim10, Chatterjee teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein the

data network includes a Very Small Aperture Terminal (VSAT) satellite network, and the

proxy in the forwarding step resides in a VSAT terminal in communication with the

content server(see paragraph 0028 and fig. 5).

As to claim11, Chatterjee teaches a method according to claim 1, further

comprising: transmitting one of the received pre-fetched objects to a browser in

response to a request from the browser(see paragraph 0014).

As to claim12, Chatterjee teaches a method according to claim 1, further

comprising:

outputting a log file to maintain statistical information on the proxy service(see

paragraph 0031).

As to claim13, Chatterjee teaches a computer-readable medium bearing

instructions for providing a proxy service to retrieve content over a data network from a

content server, said instruction, being arranged, upon execution, to cause one or more

processors to perform the method of claim 1(see paragraphs 006, 0013 and 0014).

As to claim14, Chatterjee teaches a network apparatus for providing a proxy

service to retrieve content over a data network from a content server, the apparatus

comprising:

an interface configured to forward a request for the content over the data

network towards the content server, wherein an upstream proxy in communication with

the content server determines a plurality of objects corresponding to the content based

on the request, the upstream proxy generating a list specifying the objects that are to be

pre-fetched according to a criterion (see paragraphs 006 and 0013); and

a downstream proxy configured to receive the generated list in response to the

request and to receive the pre-fetched objects on the list, wherein the downstream

proxy selectively holds a subsequent request associated with an object specified on the

list.

As to claim15, Chatterjee teaches an apparatus according to claim 14, wherein

the upstream proxy obtains domain name service (DNS) information associated with the

request and piggybacks the DNS information piggybacked onto one of the pre-fetched

objects(see paragraph 0036).

As to claim16, Chatterjee teaches an apparatus according to claim 14, wherein

the upstream proxy receives a cookie associated with one of the pre-fetched objects

and determines whether the received cookie matches that of a cookie provided in the

request, the upstream proxy not forwarding the pre-fetched object if there is no

match(see paragraphs 0048 and 0078).

As to claim 17, an apparatus according to claim 16, wherein the upstream proxy

compares a domain name specified in the request with the cookie associated with the

one pre-fetched object(see paragraph 0036).

As to claim18, Chatterjee teaches an apparatus according to claim 14, wherein

the upstream proxy assigns a plurality of identifiers corresponding to the objects in the

list, and the downstream proxy forwards a message to the upstream proxy specifying

one of the identifiers to avoid duplicate retrieval of the one corresponding object(see

paragraph 0039).

As to claim19, Chatterjee teaches an apparatus according to claim 18, wherein

the downstream proxy rejects a pre-fetched objected from the list based upon one of a

rejection of the list and a discrepancy of the identifiers(see paragraph 0039).

As to claim 20, Chatterjee teaches an apparatus according to claim 14, wherein the criterion in the forwarding step includes one of object size and object type (see paragraph 0037).

As to claim 22, Chatterjee teaches an apparatus according to claim 14, wherein the content conforms with a markup language that includes Hypertext Markup Language (HTML) (see paragraph 0017).

As to claim 23, Chatterjee teaches an apparatus according to claim 14, wherein the data network includes a Very Small Aperture Terminal (VSAT) satellite network, and the upstream proxy resides in a VSAT terminal in communication with the content server(see paragraph 0028 and fig.5).

As to claim 24, Chatterjee teaches an apparatus according to claim 14, further comprising: another interface configured to transmit one of the received pre-fetched objects to a browser in response to a request from the browser(see paragraph 0014).

As to claim 25, Chatterjee teaches an apparatus according to claim 14, wherein the downstream proxy is configured to output a log file to maintain statistical information on the proxy service(see paragraph 0031).

As to claim 26, Chatterjee teaches a method for providing a proxy service to retrieve content over a data network from a content server, the method comprising:

receiving a request for the content over the data network from a proxy;

generating a list specifying objects that are to be pre-fetched based on the request according to a criterion(see paragraph 0014);

transmitting the generated list to the proxy in response to the request; retrieving

the objects in the list from the content server(see paragraph 0031); and

forwarding the objects on the list to the proxy, wherein the proxy selectively

holds a subsequent request associated with an object specified on the list(see

paragraphs 0006 and 0014).

As to claim 27, Chatterjee teaches a method according to claim 26, further

comprising: obtaining domain name service (DNS) information associated with the

request; and forwarding the DNS information piggybacked on one of the pre-fetched

objects(see paragraph 0036).

As to claim 28, Chatterjee teaches a method according to claim 26, further

comprising:

receiving a cookie associated with one of the pre-fetched objects(see paragraph

0048);

determining whether the received cookie matches that of a cookie provided in the

request; and blocking the forwarding of the one pre-fetched object if there is no

match(see paragraphs 0039 and 0078).

As to claim 29, Chatterjee teaches a method according to claim 28, wherein the

proxy in the forwarding step compares a domain name specified in the request with the

cookie associated with the one pre-fetched object (see paragraph 0036).

As to claim 30, Chatterjee teaches a method according to claim 26, further

comprising: assigning a plurality of identifiers corresponding to the objects in the list;

and receiving a message from the proxy specifying one of the identifiers to avoid

duplicate retrieval of the one corresponding object(see paragraph 0039).

As to claim 31, Chatterjee teaches a method according to claim 30, wherein the

proxy in the receiving step rejects a pre-fetched objected from the list based upon one

of a rejection of the list and a discrepancy of the identifiers(see paragraph 0039).

As to claim 32, Chatterjee teaches a method according to claim 26, wherein the

criterion in the generating step includes one of object size and object type(see

paragraph 0037).

As to claim 34, Chatterjee teaches a method according to claim 26, wherein the

content conforms with a markup language that includes Hypertext Markup Language

(HTML) (see paragraph 0017).

As to claim 35, Chatterjee teaches a method according to claim 26, wherein the

data network includes a Very Small Aperture Terminal (VSAT) satellite network(see

paragraph 0028 and fig.5).

As to claim 36, a method according to claim 26, wherein the proxy in the

receiving step transmits one of the pre-fetched objects to a browser in response to a

request from the browser(see paragraph 0014).

As to claim37, Chatterjee teaches a method according to claim 26, further

comprising: outputting a log file to maintain statistical information on the proxy service.

(see paragraph 0031) .

As to claim 38, Chatterjee teaches a computer-readable medium bearing instructions for providing a proxy service to retrieve content over a data network from a content server, said instruction, being arranged, upon execution, to cause one or more processors to perform the method of claim 26 (see paragraphs 0006, 0011 and 0014).

As to claim 39, Chatterjee teaches a network apparatus for providing a proxy service to retrieve content over a data network from a content server, the apparatus comprising:

an interface configured to receive a request for the content over the data network from a downstream proxy(see paragraphs 0006 and 0013) ; and

an upstream proxy configured to determine a plurality of objects corresponding to the content in response to the request, and to generate a list specifying the objects that are to be pre-fetched according to a criterion, wherein the generated list is transmitted to the downstream proxy in response to the request, the upstream proxy retrieving the objects in the list from the content server, the objects on the list being forwarded to the downstream proxy, wherein the downstream proxy selectively holds a subsequent request associated with an object specified on the list (see paragraphs 0006 and 0014).

As to claim 40, Chatterjee teaches an apparatus according to claim 39, wherein the upstream proxy obtains domain name service (DNS) information associated with the request, and the DNS information is piggybacked on one of the pre-fetched objects to the downstream proxy(see paragraph 0036).

As to claim 41, Chatterjee teaches an apparatus according to claim 39, wherein the upstream proxy receives a cookie associated with one of the pre-fetched objects, and determines whether the received cookie matches that of a cookie provided in the request, the forwarding of the one pre-fetched object blocked if there is no match (see paragraphs 0048 and 0078).

As to claim 42, Chatterjee teaches an apparatus according to claim 41, wherein the downstream proxy compares a domain name specified in the request with the cookie associated with the one pre-fetched object (see paragraph 0036).

As to claim 43, Chatterjee teaches an apparatus according to claim 39, wherein the upstream proxy assigns a plurality of identifiers corresponding to the objects in the list, the upstream proxy receiving a message from the downstream proxy specifying one of the identifiers to avoid duplicate retrieval of the one corresponding object (see paragraph 0039).

As to claim 44, Chatterjee teaches an apparatus according to claim 43, wherein the downstream proxy rejects a pre-fetched objected from the list based upon one of a rejection of the list and a discrepancy of the identifiers (see paragraph 0039).

As to claim 45, Chatterjee teaches an apparatus according to claim 39, wherein the criterion includes one of object size and object type(see paragraph 0037).

As to claim 47, Chatterjee teaches an apparatus according to claim 39, wherein the content conforms with a markup language that includes Hypertext Markup Language (HTML) (see paragraph 0017).

As to claim 48, Chatterjee teaches an apparatus according to claim 39, wherein

the data network includes a Very Small Aperture Terminal (VSAT) satellite network(see

paragraph 0028 and fig.5).

As to claim 49, Chatterjee teaches an apparatus according to claim 39, wherein

the downstream proxy transmits one of the pre-fetched objects to a browser in response

to a request from the browser (see paragraph 0014).

As to claim 50, Chatterjee teaches an apparatus according to claim 39, wherein

the upstream proxy is configured to output a log file to maintain statistical information on

the proxy service (see paragraph 0031).

As to claim 51, Chatterjee teaches a system for supporting retrieval of a web

page over a data network from a web site, the system comprising:

a downstream proxy configured to receive a request message from a browser to

retrieve the web page (se paragraphs 0006 and 0013); and

an upstream proxy configured to parse the web page to determine an object

embedded in the web page, wherein a promise list is generated specifying the

embedded object that is to be pre-fetched according to a criterion, the promise list being

transmitted to the downstream proxy, wherein the upstream proxy pre-fetches the

embedded object from the web site (see paragraph 0006 and 0014), wherein the

upstream proxy determines whether to forward one of the pre-fetched embedded object

to the downstream proxy based on a comparison of cookies associated with one of the

pre-fetched objects supplied, respectively, by the browser and the web site (see

paragraphs 0048 and 0078).

As to claim 52, Chatterjee teaches a system for supporting retrieval of a web

page over a data network from a web site, the system comprising:

a first proxying means for receiving a request message from a browser to

retrieve the web page (see paragraphs 0006 and 0013); and

an second proxying means for parsing the web page to determine an object

embedded in the web page, wherein a promise list is generated specifying the

embedded object that is to be pre-fetched according to a criterion, the promise list being

transmitted to the first proxying means, wherein the second proxying means pre-fetches

the embedded object from the web site(see paragraph 0006 and 0014),

wherein the second proxying means determines whether to forward one of the

pre-fetched embedded object to the first proxying means based on a comparison of

cookies associated with one of the pre-fetched objects supplied, respectively, by the

browser and the web server(see paragraphs 0048 and 0078).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 8, 21, 33 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Chatterjee in view of official notice. Chatterjee teaches the invention

as mentioned above. Chatterjee does not explicitly teach number of objects specified in

the list in the forwarding step is limited by configurable threshold. However official notice is taken, it would have been obvious to on of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would limit the number of objects in the list as described in the instant application because doing so would limit the number of HTTP connections which make the system more efficient and robust.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In the remarks, applicants argue in summary that Chatterjee does not teach " pre - fetching object on a list ".

In response to that , Chatterjee discloses the cache prefetches a requested data page or web page (list) that contains, for example, 10 – 80 objects. Even though Chatterjee does not explicitly disclose a list but suggests that 10 – 80 objects per page must be retrieved. One of the ordinary skill in the art would have recognized the number of the objects needed to be retrieved for the web page. Therefore, Chatterjee meets the scope of the claimed limitation (see paragraphs, 0014, 0030, 0031 and 0036).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sargon N. Nano whose telephone number is (571) 272-4007. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 hour.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Sargon Nano
Aug. 1, 2007

ARIO ETIENNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100